

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were pending in the application at the time of the Office Action. The specification was objected to. Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 1-5 and 7-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. By this response, Applicant has cancelled claims 1-15 with out prejudice or disclaimer¹ and added new claims 16-29. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims are based in the specification as originally filed and that no new matter has been added. Entry of the claim amendments is respectfully requested. As such, claims 16-29 are presented for the Examiner's consideration in light of the following remarks.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

A. **Examiner Interview**

Applicant and applicant's attorney express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on November 18, 2008. This response includes the substance of the Interview.

B. **Objections**

1. **Specification**

The Office Action objected to paragraph 49 as having a typographical error. By this amendment, Applicant has corrected this typographical error. The office action also objected to paragraph 38 as containing a hyperlink. Applicant has amended this paragraph to remove the reference to the hyperlink. Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

¹ Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any cancelled claim in a subsequent divisional or continuation application.

2. Claims

The Office Action objected to claims 8 and 10-14 for typographical errors. By this amendment, Applicant has cancelled claims 8 and 10-14 thus rendering the objection moot.

C. Rejection on the Merits

1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled so the enablement rejection is rendered moot.

2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled so the statutory subject matter rejection is rendered moot.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by U.S. Pat. App. No. 2003/0233602 (hereinafter “Lindquist”). Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0194244 (hereinafter “Raventos”). Claims 1-5 and 6-15 have been cancelled so the anticipation rejection is rendered moot.

4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lindquist in view of Raventos. Claim 6 have been cancelled so the obviousness rejection is rendered moot.

D. New Claims

By this response, Applicant has added new claims 16-29. Applicant submits that new claims 16-29 are based in the originally filed specification and/or claims and that no new matter has been added.

The following chart shows the basis in the specification for each new claim.

Claim	Paragraph of Specification
Claim 16 (independent)	18, 19, 24, 25, 28, 37, 29, 40, 41, 42,
Claim 17	39
Claim 18	40
Claim 19	42
Claim 20 (independent)	40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48
Claim 21	49
Claim 22	49
Claim 23	49
Claim 24	49
Claim 25	49
Claim 26	47
Claim 27	44
Claim 28	44
Claim 29 (independent)	47, 49

As discussed in the Examiner Interview, neither Lindquist nor Raventos teaches or suggests the subject matter presented in the new claims.

Lindquist teaches using a computing services grid to route service requests to one of a group of comparable computing services instances through a common services entry point. Lindquist, para. 0010. For example, the computing services grid can perform fail-over processing to re-route service requests to one of the other comparable computing services. Lindquist, para. 0011, 0013.

Raventos teaches utilizing non-transactional resources in transaction-based services. Abstract. For instance, a plugin component can be communicatively coupled to a resource manager that defines various services that may be performed on a non-transactional resource. *Id.* The resource manager may call the particular functions defined by the plugin component as needed to perform a requested transaction. *Id.* See also, Raventos, Para. 0032 through 0034.

The resource manager can also maintain a persistent task log and can identify safe point where the resource manager can rollback, if necessary. Raventos, para. 0061.

However, as discussed in the Examiner Interview, neither Lindquist nor Raventos teach, as recited in new independent claim 16, allowing a user to interact with a graphical interface which allows a user to declare whether a software service is transactional as well as the recovery behavior of the software service. In particular, the graphical presentation displays a flow port that allows the user to visually route a flow of service invocation to another service when a termination event occurs.

Further, neither Lindquist nor Raventos teach using an execution graph and invocation map to track the connectivity and execution of services. Particularly, the execution graph is able to track context-sensitive attributes such as whether the service is transactional and recovery behavior in the manner recited in independent claim 20.

Finally, neither Lindquist nor Raventos teach invoking a composite software service and issuing commit, rollback, or compensate calls as recited in claim 29.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests entry and allowance of new independent claims 16, 20 and 29. Dependent claims 17-19 and 21-28 depend from independent claims 16 and 20 and thus incorporate the elements thereof. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17-19 and 21-28 are distinguishable over the prior art for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to claims 16 and 20.

E. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, and consistent with the tentative agreement reached during the Examiner Interview, Applicants believe the claims are in allowable form.

Applicant notes that this response does not discuss every reason why the presented claims are distinguished over the cited prior art. Most notably, applicant submits that many if not all of the dependent claims are independently distinguishable over the cited prior art. Applicant has merely submitted those arguments which it considers sufficient to clearly distinguish the claims over the cited prior art.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Application No. 10/711,322
Amendment "A" dated November 27, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed September 4, 2008

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Dated this 27th day of November, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/sara d. jones/ Registration # 47,691

SARA D. JONES

Registration No. 47,691

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

SDJ: vlr